REMARKS

Applicants first wish to thank the Examiner for the courteous telephone interview conducted with Applicants' representative, Ms. Leber, on February 15, 2006. During the interview, the claim language was discussed. Agreement was reached that amending the claims to indicate that the blade ends do not extend beyond the plastic blocks, along with other related amendments regarding the position of the blade ends, would distinguish the Francis reference. However, subsequent to the telephone interview, Applicants noticed that in the embodiment shown in Fig. 15, the ends of Francis's blade supports do not extend beyond the end links. As a result, Applicants have instead amended the independent claims to recite that no part of the subassembly extends beyond the plastic blocks, rather than that the blade ends do not extend beyond the plastic blocks.

In the office action mailed November 25, 2006, the Examiner objected to the language introduced in Applicants' response filed September 30, 2005 on the grounds that it introduced new matter and was indefinite with regard to the outer walls being "continuous." In response to these objections, Applicants have removed the language introduced in the September 30, 2005 response.

Applicants' claims stand rejected as anticipated by or obvious in view of Francis '321. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended clearly distinguish Francis. The razors discussed by Francis in all embodiments include some type of structure that extends beyond the end links. As discussed in Applicants' previous response, these "protrusions" (generally the ends of the blade supports as noted by the Examiner in the office action, but in the case of FIG. 15, separate studs 19A) are necessary in order to mount the blade unit on a handle. To modify Francis to eliminate these protrusions, such that no part of Francis's blade unit would extend beyond the end links, would result in a non-functional product, requiring a complete redesign of the handle/blade unit connection.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 30 has been added by amendment. Support for this claim is found, e.g., at page 4 of Applicant's specification (first paragraph of the Detailed Description) and in Fig. 1. Claim 30

is patentable over the art of record at least because Francis does not teach or suggest a connecting piece as recited in claim 30.

A check for $250 is enclosed in payment of the excess claim fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-674001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb 22, 2006

Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524 Reg No 30,175

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21217692.doc